



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

to the teacher, even though conditions may necessitate making certain adjustments, certain curtailments, particularly on the oral side of foreign language teaching.

E. W. BAGSTER-COLLINS

Teachers College, Columbia University

FRENCH REFERENCE GRAMMAR FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES. By J. E. MANSION, Late Senior Modern Language Master, George Watson's College, Edinburgh. D. C. Heath & Co., 247 pages.

This American edition of a work printed in Great Britain by Turnbull & Spears, Edinburgh, is a welcome addition to the long list of excellent modern language text-books published by D. C. Heath & Company. The present reviewer has no information as to whether any changes have been made, but the book seems perfectly adapted to the use of American students. The only "foreign" touch noticed was a reference to "Covent Garden" to explain "Les Halles" (p. 112). There is a wealth of examples in illustrations, most of them taken from French authors. There are no exercises.

In his Introduction the author points to differences between "affective" (purely literary) and "normal" (spoken) French. This distinction is carried throughout the work, and is of great value to the student who is sometimes puzzled when he finds in the best of authors constructions that he has been cautioned to avoid. The author's purpose is to study usage, rather than to repeat traditional rules of grammar.

Part I. deals with words as used in sentences; Part II. deals with sentence construction.

The opening chapter on the alphabet, French sounds, syllabication, etc., was doubtless not intended as a treatise on spelling or pronunciation. Naturally, this chapter is quite incomplete. A number of statements might be questioned. For instance, phoneticians will not agree that the diæresis in *ouï* makes *ou* a vowel, not a semi-vowel. There is good authority for the pronunciation [wi], not [ui] as given (p. 24, §12).

In reading the remarks on the parts of speech, one is a little startled to learn that French has eight, the articles being classed by themselves.

We are told (p. 28) that there are four cases: nominative, vocative, accusative, and dative. No reason is given for including the vocative, of which no instances are given, while omitting the genitive, of which two examples (*en* and *dont*) are cited.

The chapter on verb-forms is perhaps the least satisfactory in the book. Verbs "are divided into *two conjugations*, the *e* conjugation and the *s* conjugation, according to the ending of the first

person singular of the present indicative" (p. 29, §21). Those of us who have realized for years the helpfulness of the system explained in the JOURNAL of February 1921, can scarcely recommend Mr. Mansion's system of teaching French verbs.

On the other hand, the chapter on the uses of tenses (pp. 59-70) is the best I have seen. The tenses are platted, and their uses are very well explained. This chapter will be of benefit to all teachers of French, no matter what may be their preference in the way of grammars or methods.

It is doubtful whether the classification of verbs as of the active, passive, or pronominal voice (pp. 50-57) will appeal to many teachers of modern languages. The chapter on the passive (pp. 52-55) is good.

The statement that the double accusative is unknown in French (p. 73, §92.3) may be questioned. Consider the verb *payer*. I suppose the author would consider the second accusative here an "adverbial" accusative of measure.

Not infrequently it seems that the grammatical explanations offered in this book serve rather to interpret the meaning of the French, without aiding in constructing the French. This is especially true of the chapter on the infinitive, in the handling of which the advanced student generally finds his greatest difficulties, and in the explanation of which the ordinary teacher can give little or no help. The seeker after information is confused by a large number of pointless, overlapping categories. For instance, on page 77 we find the following: "The Dependent Infinitive governed by *à* denotes Tendency, Aim, Direction (§99.) Dependent on a verb. I. It stands as adverb equivalent instead of a noun." Examples (among others): *Je me plais à la lecture. Je me plais à lire.* Under the same general heading (§99.4), we find another category: "4. It stands in adverbial relation to a verb with a noun-object which is not particularized." Ex. *J'aurai beaucoup de plaisir à vous revoir.* Why this mystery? In the two examples given, the function of *à* is exactly the same: it has the same prepositional value. But in the latter category ("with a noun-object which is not particularized"), we find also the example: *J'ai une visite à faire.* Here the function of *à* is not quite identical with that in the example: *J'aurai beaucoup de plaisir à vous revoir.* Peculiarly, we find in the second category (§99.2) *J'ai à faire une visite*, in which the infinitive is construed as direct object of *avoir*. Once as "direct object," again "in adverbial relation to a verb with a noun-object which is not particularized!" But on the next page (p. 78, §102), we learn that "The infinitive governed by *à* has a number of important idiomatic uses. 1. Adjectival"; and here we find given as an example: *Maison à louer.* Let us make a complete sentence, and we have: *J'ai une*

maison à louer—exactly the same construction as in *J'ai une visite à faire*. Now, to return to the statement concerning the noun-object not particularized, what is the difference between *J'ai une visite à faire* and *J'ai encore cette visite à faire*? We wonder what "not particularized" has to do with the construction. Then consider *La visite est encore à faire*, and we wonder what the "noun-object" has to do with it.

Again, in a note on page 80, we are invited to "Distinguish between the infinitive dependent on *bon* (= 'good,' 'fit'), as in *Un fruit bon à manger*, and the infinitive linked up by *de*, not to *bon*, but to the statement *Vous êtes bien bon*" (in *Vous êtes bien bon de m'inviter*). But this latter example has just appeared to illustrate a "non-prepositional" use of *de* to "link up the infinitive with—(d) Adjectives"! I doubt whether any student would be enabled to explain the difference between *Je suis prêt à vous voir* and *Je suis heureux de vous voir*. Why insist that *de* is "non-prepositional" in *Êtes-vous capable de résister aux fatigues du voyage*? I should say that *de* is a preposition in *Nous sommes heureux d'apprendre cette nouvelle*; it may well be construed as meaning "from," pointing backward to cause or source.

On page 79 (§106), we find *pour* to express "to" after "*assez* + adjective." Ex. *Vous êtes assez grand pour savoir cela*. Certainly the adjective has nothing to do with *pour*. Cf.: *Il parle assez haut* (adverb) *pour se faire entendre*, and *Il ne l'aime pas assez pour l'épouser*, and *J'ai assez d'argent pour y aller*.

In the discussion of the gerund (p. 86, §115.3 (d)), we note that the infinitive is used after *prepositions* other than *en*, and we find this example: *On m'épargna la peine d'écrire*. But on p. 80, §107.(c), in *Aurons-nous le plaisir de vous voir*? *de* is non-prepositional! Conséquent, n'est-cepas?

I might multiply examples to illustrate this confusion.

A very serious omission in connection with the infinitive construction is the absence of lists of verbs requiring the direct infinitive, the infinitive with *à*, and the infinitive with *de* respectively. It is difficult to understand how a reference grammar can have failed in this respect.

Certainly some grammarians will object to the statement (p. 89, §119) that "Transitive verbs are (a) Directly transitive—or (b) Indirectly transitive, the object being governed by the prepositions *à* or *de*." Ex. (a): *J'aime Pierre*. *Je l'appelle*, etc. (b): *Je pense à vous*. *Je me repens de ma faute*, etc.

Why not complete the list of seven nouns in *-ou* which form the plural in *-oux* (by adding *pou*)? (p. 96, §131.4.)

Incessamment is included among adverbs in *-ment* which "have to-day no corresponding adjectives" (p. 102, §151). I find *incessant* in several dictionaries (e. g. *Gasc*, *Petit Larousse*).

It is not quite true that "The definite article is used in French, though not in English—before proper nouns qualified by an adjective" (p. 109). We find *petit Jules* as well as *le petit Jules*. Note here that there is no mention of the flavor lent by the article in *la Thénardier*.

Under "Omission of the definite and indefinite articles" we find (p. 112, §170.10): *Il est arrivé sans argent, Il n'avait ni dignité ni aisance dans ses manières, Je ne le ferai ni pour or ni pour argent*. It is the partitive that is omitted here, not the article.

Although it may be true, it is a little startling to learn that the masculine singular form of the demonstrative adjective is *cet*, but that it "drops the *t* before a consonant or 'aspirate' *h*" (p. 116, §172).

The statement (p. 137, §234.2), "A double subject is always stressed" (i. e. disjunctive), should read "A personal pronoun in a compound subject or object." For example: *Mon père et moi y serons. Vous, lui, elle, et moi y irons. Je (les) ai vu(s) lui et elle. J'en donnerai à votre père et à vous*.

It might be well (p. 140, §241) to explain just when the euphonic *l* is desirable and when, even to avoid hiatus, its use is barred.

I am one of those who still believe the "statement found in many French grammars that *ne point* denies more strongly, is more emphatic, than *ne pas*" (p. 155, §269, note).

We might add *bouger* to the other four verbs which may be made negative by *ne* alone (p. 158, §274.1 (a)).

I question the classification of *de* "To form adverb phrases, expressing (a) A point of departure in space or time" in the examples: *Je vous l'ai dit plus d'une fois* and *Je suis Anglais de naissance* (p. 161, §279.1). I had supposed that in the first case, *de* represents the ablative after a comparative, *quam* being omitted. In the second case, I think *de* means "by virtue of" rather than "from" (point of departure in time).

It would be simple, and helpful to explain the reason for using *de* to mean "in" in *Le meilleur élève de la classe* (p. 162, §280, note).

I believe "*en l'honneur*" would complete the list of cases in which the definite article follows *en* (p. 166, §285, note).

It is explained that "Ni is not used before both verbs" in *Il ne mange ni ne boit* (p. 172, §311, note 1); but we are not told how this differs from *Il ne veut ni manger ni boire* and *Il n'a ni mangé ni bu*.

Part II. is rather unique, and is exceedingly helpful. It deals with sentence construction, and reveals many points in the expressiveness of the French that are generally unknown to all who have not a thorough knowledge of the language. The discussion of order hinges largely upon the introductory remarks on stress, and the excellent chapter on principles of word-order. It

shows, for instance, why we have *Nous l'attendons à Londres jeudi prochain* in answer to the question *Quand attendez-vous votre frère?*; while we have *Nous l'attendons jeudi à Londres* in answer to the question *Où comptez-vous retrouver votre frère?* We see also that there is a very real difference between *Peu après, César conquiert la Gaule* and *Peu après, la Gaule fut conquise par César*. Other considerations, such as lucidity and word-groups, are also treated.

Other chapters treat of Normal Word-Order, Interrogative Word-Order, Inversion of Subject and Verb in Non-Interrogative Sentences, Position of the Epithet Adjective, The Simple Sentence, The Complex Sentence (in which the indicative and subjunctive are contrasted in Noun Clauses, Adjective Clauses, Adverb Clauses), Subjunctive Avoided, Tense Sequence, Multiple Sentences, Dependent Infinitive Clauses, Participle and Gerund Clauses, The Concords. The subject is approached from the point of view of logic, the reason for doing a certain thing in a certain way, which is always most helpful.

Just a few questions here:

The order of personal pronoun objects (p. 184, §330 & 331) might be made clearer. We find here *Donnez-nous-les*, with a note: "One sometimes hears also: *Donnez-les-nous*." Is the first order correct? It is not recognized by Fraser & Squair (original, p. 270).

It might simplify matters somewhat to give a list of adverbs that never come between the auxiliary and the past participle in a compound tense (p. 187, §333.2).

I doubt whether the student will grasp the significance of the statement (p. 219, §402), "If the subject of a dependent noun clause is already contained in the head clause, either (a) as subject, or (b) as object, the dependent clause is usually in the infinitive mood, and not in a finite mood introduced by *que*." Will the student distinguish, for instance, between *I invited him to come* (in which *him* is the object of *invited* as well as the subject of *come*) and *I want him to come* (in which *him* is only the subject of *to come*, *to come* itself being the object of *want*)? I find that the student understands much more readily, when one explains that an infinitive construction is possible in spite of a change of subject (Cf. *I want to go* and *I want him to go*) after verbs of causing (including verbs of commanding, requesting, inviting, etc.), verbs of permitting, and verbs of perceiving: *I have him read*. *I let him read*. *I hear him read*.

Only a very few typographical errors were noticed: p. 102, §150.4: *résolument* for *résolument* (second time); p. 138, §236.2. (2): *Mais, dit-le paysan*, for *dit le*; p. 188, §336: *M. de Humboldt à le premier, je crois, constaté ce fait* (*à* for *a*).

To sum up my impressions of the work, I would say that it will be helpful in giving us a new view point; it will explain the

wherefore of things that we learned as mere grammatical rules; it will interpret the French very satisfactorily; certain chapters will, perhaps, give more material than any other work, especially the chapters on tenses and on sentence structure. Every teacher of French ought to study the book with care. But I doubt whether we can send our students to it with the same confidence as to that wonderfully complete, clear, and concise work by Fraser and Squair.

E. F. HACKER

The Ohio State University

FLEURS DE FRANCE: Poésies lyriques depuis le Romantisme
Avec introduction de W. P. KER, professeur de poésie à Oxford
et préface de Lady Frazer. XVI+160 pages. Oxford University Press. 1921.

"Cette collection de poèmes n'a pas la prétention de représenter toutes les variétés de caractères et toutes les formes de la poésie française pendant les cent dernières années."

Telle est l'idée principale de l'introduction de M. le professeur Ker, de l'université d'Oxford, introduction ingénieuse s'il en fut puisqu'elle va au devant de la seule critique que l'on puisse faire à une anthologie, c'est-à-dire la critique du choix des morceaux. Qu'il nous soit permis de constater que M. Ker attaque dans ces quelques lignes la nature même de l'anthologie, qui doit représenter de la façon la plus complète possible une certaine branche de la littérature d'un pays à une certaine époque. L'emploi du mot anthologie s'appliquant à l'ouvrage en question ne nous sera pas refusé puisque M. Kerr lui même fait usage de la même dénomination dans son introduction.

Il nous semble, d'autre part, que le titre de l'ouvrage lui-même, "Fleurs de France," attire une certaine responsabilité sur son auteur, et devrait l'obliger à ne pas omettre certains spécimens (et non des moindres) de la flore française. C'est ainsi que nous aurions aimé trouver dans la partie intitulée "Les Modernes" quelques poèmes représentatifs de Jean Aicard et de Jean Richepin. Ce dernier a-t-il été omis intentionnellement à cause de ses audaces et de sa crudité? C'est probable. Il n'en est pas moins vrai qu'en dépit de ces défauts, qu'on pourrait facilement éviter par un choix judicieux (quelques passages de "La Mer" par exemple), Jean Richepin est le plus vigoureux de nos poètes modernes et on ne saurait le passer sous silence dans une anthologie.

Une place aurait pu également être laissée à quelques poètes provinciaux tels que Gabriel Vicaire, Jules Breton, Charles de Pomairols, Maurice Rollinat, etc., qui représentent un des plus pittoresques côtés de notre poésie actuelle.

Ces critiques faites en dépit des avertissements de l'introduction, n'enlèvent rien à la réelle valeur du livre. Nous devons